


REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Action under reply, the Examiner rejected all of Applicant's claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lucast, 6,198,016 in view of Yam, 6,015,547.

Applicants have studied the primary Lucast patent and believe that it may have been cited in error. Contrary to the Examiner's assertions in Section 2 of the Action, Lucast does not disclose an aqueous solution for use in an ostomy pouch, does not teach solutions of cellulosic lubricating agents or polymeric lubricating agents and, as far as Applicants can determine, does not even discuss surfactants. However, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Lucast does mention deodorizing components. The Applicants respectfully request clarification of the Examiner's position with regard to Lucast as a reference to support a Section 103 rejection.

In the event any fees are necessary, kindly charge the cost thereof to our Deposit Account No. 13-2855.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeremy R. Kriegel
Reg. No. 39,257

Date: October 27, 2005

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 South Wacker Drive, Suite 6300 Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
Telephone: (312) 474-6300
Facsimile: (312) 474-0448